



Room:

Reporter:

Report \_\_\_ / 6

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Qualitative phenomena explanation		Investigated the role of main parameters	
Properly used the literature		Correct treatment of data (relevant experiments, error estimations, comparison between theory and data)	
Developed appropriate models			
Experiments and/or numerical simulations		Answered all questions of the problem	

Debate \_\_\_ / 3

nothing → well done

0 1 2 3

nothing → well done

0 1 2 3

Insightful explanations to the questions		Team work	
Capacity to reflect and improve the work with new ideas/feedback.		Made clear and meaningful conclusions	

Additional \_\_\_ / 2

nothing → well done

0 1 2

nothing → well done

0 1 2

Speech and slide quality (clarity, coherence, structure, fluency)		Jury questions	
--	--	----------------	--

Remarks:

Final mark:

+  +  +  =   
Report    Debate    Additional    Bonus(±1)

Opponent:

Speech \_\_\_ / 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

0 1 2 3 4 5

Good understanding of physics of the problem AND of the solution presented by the Reporter		Proposed relevant points to improve and discuss	
		Enriched the audience's report understanding	
Pointed out pros & cons of the report			

Debate \_\_\_ / 4

nothing → well done

0 2 4

nothing → well done

0 2 4

Clarifying questions		Relevant topics, prioritization and variety of the subjects	
Focused on improving the report		Team work	

Additional \_\_\_ / 2

nothing → well done

0 1 2

nothing → well done

0 1 2

Speech and slide quality (clarity, coherence, structure, fluency)		Jury questions	
--	--	----------------	--

Remark:

Final mark:

+  +  +  =   
Speech    Debate    Additional    Bonus(±1)

\*These remarks are intended as guideline indications and are not to be taken as strict instructions. Their appearance in the same column does not make them equal in points and for the jury to decide their importance.